



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,567	02/20/2004	Luis F. Barron	DP-311107	7552
7590	10/10/2006			EXAMINER BASTIANELLI, JOHN
JIMMY L. FUNKE DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. Legal Staff Mail Code: 480-410-202 P.O. Box 5052 Troy, MI 48007-5052			ART UNIT 3753	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 10/10/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/783,567	BARRON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> John Bastianelli	<b>Art Unit</b> 3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2006.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1,4-7 and 9-11 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,4-7 and 9-11 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 November 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.                    5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
                   6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okazaki et al. US 5,915,416 in view of Teranishi US 5,282,329.

Okazaki lacks the rod distanced from the ball in the deenergized position. Teranishi discloses a rod 25 distanced from a ball 17 in the deenergized position. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the rod and ball as disclosed by Okazaki with the rod distanced from the ball by .1 to .8 mm in order to reduce hysteresis (col. 5, lines 39-43) as disclosed by Teranishi. Okazaki discloses a solenoid valve having a valve housing supporting a coil 48; a ball 51 in the valve housing, a valve seat 41e in the valve housing, and a rod 56 reciprocatingly disposed in the valve housing between a deenergized configuration, wherein the coil is deenergized and the ball is against the valve seat, and an energized configuration, wherein the coil is energized and the rod is urged against the ball to move the ball away from the valve seat, wherein the valve housing defines the valve seat and is made integrally with a winding bay 41, the coil being wound in the winding bay, and the valve housing has a ball retainer rib 52 defining a supply port 42 having a first diameter and the ball between the rib and the valve seat in a second diameter larger than the first diameter, wherein the rib is not deformable and the ball is not passed through the rib. The valve housing defines a

control port 43 and an exhaust port 44. A vehicle fluid system communicates with the valve.

The valve has a primary plate 45 and a terminal 46 with the housing injection molded around the plate and terminal to form the valve seat and winding bay.

3. Claims 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okazaki et al. US 5,915,416 in view of Gaylord US 3,907,046.

Okazaki lacks the rib being deformable. Gaylord discloses a deformable rib 30 in which a valve passes through. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the rib of Okazaki deformable as disclosed by Gaylord in order to take less steps in assembling the valve. The examiner would like to note that “is pressable through the rib” is a product by process claim. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process (see MPEP 2113).

#### *Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments filed September 4, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

5. Regarding the argument to claim 1, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The applicant is using Okazaki as the base reference and modified by Teranashi.

Teranashi clearly discloses the rod separated from the ball which is the feature used by the examiner. The examiner would like to note that the breadth of claim 1 was completely changed due to removing claim language and adding new.

6. Regarding the applicant's arguments to claim 7, once again in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The applicant is using Okazaki as the base reference and modified by Gaylord. The applicant appears to be reading more into the claims than what is actually claimed.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Bastianelli whose telephone number is (571) 272-4921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
John Bastianelli  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3751

  
JB

September 30, 2006